

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| | T | | L mmo na vinu no overma vo | G03151534455034340 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 09/942,642 | 08/31/2001 | Yoshiya Okamoto | 1095.1195 | 8809 |
| 21171 | 7590 11/28/2007 | | EXAMINER | |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 | | | . AKINTOLA, OLABODE | |
| | | | | |
| WASHINGTON, DO 20003 | | | 3691 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 11/28/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 09/942,642 | OKAMOTO ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Olabode Akintola | 3691 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONEL | l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. C (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | • | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Se |)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10 September 2007</u> . | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-9 and 11-13</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-9 and 11-13</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | election requirement | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| See the attached detailed Office action for a list | or the certified copies not receive | u. | | | | |
| AMa-shara-art/a) | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Da | ate | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | atent Application | | | | |

Art Unit: 3691

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/10/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 3691

Claims 2-9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahr (USPAP 20030033245) (Kahr) in view of Szlam (USPN 6868395) (Szlam).

Re claims 2-9 and 11-13: Kahr teaches a method of inviting a debtor to alter of contract contents concerning payment terms of a loan, the method comprising: extracting target customers satisfying conditions for being a defaulting debtor from all debtors (paragraph 0016); notifying each of the target customers, by postal mail or E-mail, of an invitation to alter present contract contents of the loan to allow relaxation of payment terms (paragraphs 0018, 0028); simulating a new payment plan based on new contract contents, based on an access from the target customer (paragraph 0020); and altering the present contract contents to the new contract content when the target customer consents to the alteration to the new contract contents based on a result of the simulation (paragraph 0022).

Kahr does not explicitly teach an address of a Web site at which an application to alter the present contract contents is received. Szlam teaches the step of notifying each of the extracted debtors, by postal mail or E-mail, of an invitation to alteration of present contract contents to other contract contents which allow relaxation of payment terms, and an address of a Web site at which an application for the alteration of the present contract contents is received (col. 1, line 65 - col. 2, lines 11, col. 3, lines 21-25, col. 12, lines 12-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kahr to include the aforementioned step as taught by Szlam. One would have been motivated to do as a means of allowing the debtor to review, selects and complete the information and options via the web (Szlam: col. 12, lines 32-34).

Art Unit: 3691

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Neely (USPN 6044362) discloses electronic invoicing and payment system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3691

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA

HANI M. KAZIMI PRIMARY EXAMINER